

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/7tLT+931	UL. 13/83	PCTIOU		AL10 . Da60

MERCER, STAPLER & SPINAR 1510, NO PERM CENTER PLACE COLLABOLITHIA, CA 10102

EXAMINER			
Lidding			
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
9 - 19 - 19, 2, 2_ s_1	/3		
ATE MAILED:	00. LD. 00		

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

## COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 3/30/86	This action is made final.				
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s), days from Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.	om the date of this letter.				
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:					
L Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.					
	tent Application, Form PTO-152				
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 6.					
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION					
1. $\bowtie$ Claims $41 - 88$	are pending in the application.				
Of the above, claims 83 – 85	are pesiting in the application.				
Of the above, claims 09-85	are withdrawn from consideration.				
2. Claims	have been cancelled.				
3. Claims	are allowed				
111 00 1 00					
4. 12 Claims 41 - 82 and 86-88	are rejected.				
S. Claims	are objected to.				
6. Claims are subject	to restriction or election requirement.				
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purpo matter is indicated.	ses until such time as allowable subject				
8. Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this C	Office action.				
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on These drag not acceptable (see explanation).	awings are acceptable;				
10. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of contact (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation)	drawings, filed on				
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed	bility to ensure that the drawings are				
12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has	been received not been received				
been filed in parent application, serial no; filed on					
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in					
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.					
14.  Other					

Art Unit 123

Claims 42-52, 54, 56, 58. 60-61, 63-82 and 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are again considered to be functional, indefinite and alternative for the reasons stated in the last Office action. The terms "substituted (all occurrences) and "a precursor" are still considered to render the claims indefinite.

Applicant's arguments filed March 20, 1986 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicants are required by the statute to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention and the claims in their present form do not meet this requirement.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title. if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit 123

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 42-48, 86 and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over each of the patents to Szarek et al., Nair et al., the PCT French patent or the Kochetkov et al reference for the reasons of record, paper No. 10.

Again, the applicants arguments have been carefully noted, but are not convincing. Although the references do not show the removal of a substituted alkyl protective group from a saccharide moiety, the removal of other protective groups is shown in the various references. Note the French Patent in particular. It would still appear to be obvious to prepare other di, tri. oligo, etc. saccharides from the prior art processes to any person of ordinary skill in the art having the above references before him in the absence of verified data to the contrary.

Claim 88 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over each of the Szarek et al., Nair et al., PCT French Patent and Kochetkov et al references for the reasons stated above in combination with the Towey

Serial No. 457,931 Art Unit

123

et al and Curtin et al references for the reasons stated in the last Office action.

The arguments presented by applicants are not convincing. The same rationale applies for this rejection as stated above.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Art Unit 123

Claims 49-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) (b), (e) and (f) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over each of the patents to Lormeau et al. '662, '758 and '770. Each of the patents discloses heparin fractions of di, tri and oligosaccharides and further disclose pharmaceutical compositions thereof and their use in a method for treating thrombosis. The instant compounds, compositions and methods are deemed to be anticipated thereby or prima facie obvious therefrom.

Claims 83-85 stand withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention for the reasons stated in Paper No. 10. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP 821.03.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to J. R. Brown at telephone number 703-557-5055.

Brown:ebw

6/13/86

JOHNNIE R. BROWN PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 123